The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2021

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3273484
56 Rosslyn Avenue, Feltham TW14 9LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Owen Hunte against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref 00963/56/P1, dated 21 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2021.
- The development proposed is the erection of a 2-storey rear extension with part flat and part hipped roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling that lies in a predominantly residential area within which buildings vary in type, size and design. On one side of the site is a bungalow that is orientated at an off set angle to the road while on the other side is a 2-storey dwelling that is attached to No 56. At the rear of No 56 is a ground floor rear extension with a flat roof.

4. The proposal is to enlarge No 56 with a part single storey, part 2-storey rear extension. The new first floor element would have a hipped roof and be set back from the rear of the ground floor component, which would have a flat roof. It would extend across the entire ground floor width of the host dwelling and project outwards from the main rear wall for a considerable depth.

5. In doing so, the appeal scheme would elongate the built form of No 56, significantly enlarge its footprint and noticeably add to its scale and mass. Both the width and depth of the new addition would exceed the maximum threshold for extensions of this type set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extension Guidelines* (REG). These guidelines aim to balance the need to allow people to extend their property and prevent, amongst other things, harm to the character of the house and the local area.

6. In my opinion, the new addition would be disproportionate in scale, bulk and depth to the host building even taking into account the built form and site

coverage of the existing rear extension. It could not reasonably be described as a subordinate addition, which is expected of development proposals under Policy SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP). The rear of the main building would be overwhelmed by the considerable scale, depth and mass of the new extension. As such, it would spoil intrinsic character and appearance of the appeal property.

7. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to the proposed use of external materials to match the existing building. I also acknowledge that the plot is wider than that of its attached counterpart at No 54 due to the first floor overpass that provides access to the back garden of the appeal dwelling.

8. Views of the rear addition from public vantage points would be limited given its position at the back of the main house. While only partly glimpsed from the road, the proposed extension would nonetheless form part of the characteristics of the area as experienced and appreciated from nearby properties. When viewed from the rear of No 54, for instance, the proposed extension would appear as an uncharacteristically large and bulky addition.

9. While I saw that several properties along Rosslyn Avenue and adjacent streets have been extended at the rear none included both ground and first floor additions in the manner proposed. In any event, each development proposal should be assessed on its own merits as I have done.

10. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it conflicts with LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and also the guidance within the Council's REG. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development, amongst other things, complements the original building and the character of the local area.

11. Once complete, the proposed extension would provide valuable additional living space and extra bedrooms for the appellant and his family. It would also allow the existing layout of the dwelling to be remodeled to better suit the appellant's needs. I am sympathetic to these personal considerations and note that an alternative option of extending into the roof space is constrained by the need to lower the height of the first floor ceiling. I also note that the thermal efficiency of the finished building would be improved and that the appeal scheme provides a more appropriate way to dispose of surface water. I agree that no harm would be caused to the living conditions of others. However, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

12. The appellant states that the depth of the ground floor extension is within the limits allowable as permitted development under the government's larger home extension scheme. However, the appeal scheme should be assessed as a whole because from my inspection of the plans the ground and first floor elements of the new extension are not clearly severable into separate parts.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR